

---

---

# 5D

## Information

### *Professional Services Committee*

#### **Update on the Review of the Accreditation Framework**

---

**Executive Summary:** In June 2004, the Accreditation Study Work Group, comprised of members of the Committee on Accreditation and representatives of stakeholders, began meeting to review and recommend any changes, if needed, to the Commission's accreditation system for educator preparation in California. The work group met in August and September 2004. This report is an update on the activities of the Accreditation Study Work Group.

**Recommended Action:** This is an information item that requires no action.

**Presenters:** Cheryl Hickey and Teri Clark, Consultants, Professional Services Division



---

# Update on the Review of the Accreditation Framework

---

## Introduction

This agenda item provides an update on activities related to the review of the *Accreditation Framework*. The Accreditation Study Work Group has begun meeting but there have been no recommendations to this point for the Committee on Accreditation (COA) to review. This update is for information only and requires no action.

## Background

In January 2004, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) directed the Committee on Accreditation (COA) to meet with stakeholders to identify options for establishing a process for the review of the Commission's *Accreditation Framework* that would be open, inclusive of key stakeholders, and consultative. At its meeting in May 2004, the Commission authorized the formation of an Accreditation Study Work Group. This work group, comprised of four members of the Committee on Accreditation and various representatives from the education stakeholder community, is charged with reviewing the Commission's current accreditation system and recommending any changes, if needed, to the Committee on Accreditation for its consideration. In turn, the Committee on Accreditation will submit its recommendations for changes to the system to the Commission for its consideration. The Accreditation Study Work Group has held two meetings. This report provides an update of activities that have taken place in recent weeks related to this review.

## Update on the Accreditation Review

In May 2004, the COA following Commission action developed a general timeline for the review process as well as a concise list of deliverables and expectations for the work group. The general timeline proposed by the COA took into consideration the Commission's schedule for 2004-2005 as well as recognition that a key component of the review is to ensure frequent communication and interaction between the work group, the COA, and the Commission. The Accreditation Study Work Group was formed in June 2004. Stakeholder groups appointed representatives to the work group. The COA selected four individuals from its membership to serve on the Accreditation Study Work Group. The initial meeting of the Accreditation Study Work Group was held June 16 and 17, 2004.

The Accreditation Study Work Group is responsible for much of the research, issue exploration, and identification of options for redesign. The recommendations and options from the work group will be brought to the COA for its consideration. In turn, the COA will then bring its recommendations and options for any potential changes to the accreditation system to the

Commission for its consideration. In order to ensure that all perspectives are addressed, the work group is co-facilitated by one representative of the COA and one individual chosen by the stakeholders. Work group members are required to be vested with the authority to represent and speak on behalf of their institution, organization, or constituency group. To the extent possible, the work group operates on a consensus model, although it was agreed that, where significant differences in perspectives exist, these differences will be reflected in documentation. Each representative, with the exception of the COA members serving on the work group, commits to supporting the costs of their segmental participation in the review process.

The group focused much of its first meeting on identifying the numerous issues that would need to be addressed throughout the review process and attempting to determine a plan for addressing these issues. The work group generated a list of issues requiring attention during the review and attributes of the current system that are valued. A copy of this list is included as Appendix A to this agenda item. Several issues were identified as needing attention at the outset of the review and were scheduled to be studied first—at the August and September meetings.

### **August 2004 Meeting of Accreditation Study Work Group**

The second meeting of the Accreditation Study Work Group was held on August 17 and 18, 2004, at the Commission office in Sacramento. The major discussion topics for this meeting included: (1) the purpose of Accreditation, including accreditation in other professions; (2) the role of CTC and COA as defined in education code, the current *Accreditation Framework*, and in implementation; and (3) the relationship between national accreditation, NCATE, and the current accreditation system. The discussions were viewed as foundational in nature ensuring that all work group members have a solid understanding of the current accreditation system. The expectation is that at the next meeting, each of these topics will be revisited and the discussion will begin to move toward consensus and allow preliminary recommendations to be formed.

During the first meeting of the work group, members were asked to survey their constituencies for their views on the purpose(s) of accreditation, trends in accreditation, major accreditation issues, and strengths and weaknesses in the current accreditation system. Copies of the responses from each constituency were provided for all work group members. The information compiled from the stakeholder groups was used during the discussions. In keeping with their intent to gather feedback from the field, work group members were asked to survey their constituencies on the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) nominating and training processes prior to the September meeting.

Background materials for the group prepared by staff and members of the workgroup were numerous and are available at the Commission's website. For instance, resources were gathered related to the purpose of accreditation as defined by other accrediting bodies, in other professions, and in other states and countries to determine whether the purpose as defined by the Framework was still appropriate. In addition, to ensure that the work group understands the connection between the education code and accreditation policy as defined by the *Accreditation Framework*, pertinent sections of the current *Accreditation Framework* with language directly

from the education code italicized was provided to the work group. A copy of this is included as Appendix B to this agenda item.

The report from the American Institutes for Research (AIR) includes numerous findings and recommendations related to the accreditation system. To facilitate the use of this report during the discussion, staff prepared a key, identifying the pages and findings or recommendations related to the topics discussed at this meeting. A copy of this key is included as Appendix C to this agenda item.

The Accreditation Study Work Group reviewed the Education Code and the *Accreditation Framework* to understand the current relationship between the Commission and the COA. In the preliminary discussion it was noted that the education community values the fact that experienced educators, both K-12 and university level, review the reports from accreditation site visits and make accreditation decisions. Further information on this topic will be provided at a future meeting of the Commission.

In keeping with the intent of an open line of communication between the work group, the COA, and the Commission, the work group members and staff provided an update of the activities and discussions to the COA at its meeting on August 19, 2004.

### **September Meeting of Accreditation Study Work Group**

The September meeting of the Accreditation Study Work Group will be held on September 22 and 23, 2004. In September, in addition to the ongoing discussions from the August meeting, the work group will discuss issues related to: (1) induction, subject matter, and fifth year; (2) federal and state accountability issues; and (3) the nature of data used by others for accreditation purposes. Depending on the outcomes of the work group meeting in September, an agenda insert may be provided to update the Commission on the activities from the meeting.

Consistent with the Commission's directive that the review process be open, inclusive, and transparent, informal meeting notes and all meeting materials will be available for review on the Commission's website.

The next meetings for the accreditation study work group are scheduled for October 22, 2004 and November 17 & 18, 2004 at the Commission office. An update of the work group and COA activities related to this review will be provided to the Commission at the November 30-December 1, 2004 meeting.



## Appendix A

### ACCREDITATION STUDY WORK GROUP

June 16-17, 2004

| WHAT IS THE THING THAT YOU WOULD <u>MOST</u> WANT THIS REVIEW TO ADDRESS   | WHAT IS THE ONE THING THAT YOU WANT TO <u>MAINTAIN</u>   |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better templates for Self Study</li> <li>• Better templates for document to COA</li> <li>• How we use quantifiable data, what data, role of data, intelligent use of data, use of qualitative with quantitative data</li> <li>• Models of best practices</li> <li>• National accreditation</li> <li>• Relationship with NCATE</li> <li>• Accreditation in other professions</li> <li>• Stipulations, revisits, sanctions (what is bad enough, are sanctions used effectively)</li> <li>• Accreditation as a framework for program improvement. How does it contribute to our understanding of effectiveness in programs? How does it inform practice?</li> <li>• What is accreditation and what is its purpose</li> <li>• Impact of candidate assessment to inform accreditation</li> <li>• More teachers represented in process, participation and inclusion of K-12, articulation between K-12/higher ed.</li> <li>• Unit accreditation versus program approval</li> <li>• Historical perspective versus snapshot approach (use of past accreditation findings, follow up reports)</li> <li>• Ensuring balance, bring process current</li> <li>• Adequate funding of accreditation</li> <li>• Link to Student Achievement, can it be done?</li> <li>• Self study reports – can they be done differently?</li> <li>• Training and education of reviewers</li> <li>• Public Perception about accreditation</li> <li>• Focus on outcomes and effectiveness</li> <li>• More diverse visit teams</li> <li>• Shift from “factors to consider” to “required elements”</li> <li>• Time lag between visits</li> <li>• Have changes in recent years been positive?</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer Review (noted by many)</li> <li>• Site visit (noted by many)</li> <li>• Self Study</li> <li>• Concept of mixed teams</li> <li>• Inclusion of qualitative data</li> <li>• Professional nature of review</li> <li>• Professional decision-making</li> <li>• Sanctions</li> </ul> |

## Appendix B

### Accreditation Framework and California Education Code

| Accreditation Framework-Section 1  | Ed. Code   |
|--|--|
| Authority and Responsibilities of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing  |  |
| <b>A. Responsibilities Related to Accreditation Policies</b>   |  |
| <b>1. Adopt and Modify the Accreditation Framework.</b> <i>The Commission has the authority and responsibility to adopt an Accreditation Framework, “which sets forth the policies of the Commission regarding the accreditation of educator preparation in California” (Education Code Section 44372-a). The present document is the adopted Accreditation Framework. The Commission may modify the Framework in accordance with Section 8 of the Framework. Modifications occur in public meetings after the Commission considers relevant information provided by the Committee on Accreditation, institutions, accreditation team members, the Commission’s staff, and other concerned individuals. The Commission determines when a policy modification takes effect.</i> | 44371 (a)<br>44371 (b)<br>44372 (a)<br>44372 (i) |
| <b>2. Establish and Modify Standards for Educator Preparation.</b> Pursuant to Education Code Section 44372-b, <i>the Commission has the authority and responsibility to establish and modify standards for educator preparation in California.</i>  | 44372 (b)  |
| <b>B. Responsibilities Related to Accreditation Decisions</b>  |  |
| <b>1. Initial Accreditation of Institutions.</b> In accordance with Education Code Sections 44227-a and 44372-c and Section 4 of this <i>Framework</i> , <i>the Commission determines the eligibility of an institution that applies for initial accreditation and that has not previously prepared educators for state certification in California.</i> The Commission accredits institutions that meet the criteria that have been adopted for that purpose by the Commission. Institutional accreditation by the Commission establishes the eligibility of an institution to submit specific program proposals to the Committee on Accreditation.   | 44372 (c)  |
| <b>2. Hear and Resolve Accreditation Appeals.</b> <i>The Commission hears appeals of accreditation decisions, which must be based on evidence that accreditation procedures or decisions were “arbitrary, capricious, unfair, or contrary to the policies of the Commission or the procedural guidelines of the Committee on Accreditation” (Education Code Section 44374-e). The Commission resolves each appeal, and the Executive Director communicates the Commission’s decision to the Committee on Accreditation, the accreditation team, and the affected institution.</i>  | 44372 (f)<br>44372 (e)<br>44374 (e)              |
| <b>C. Responsibilities Related to the Committee on Accreditation</b>   |  |
| <b>1. Establish a Nominating Panel.</b> <i>In collaboration with the Accreditation Advisory Council and subsequently with the Committee on Accreditation, the Commission establishes a Nominating Panel to solicit and screen nominations and recommend educators to serve on the Committee on Accreditation.</i>  | 44373 (b)  |
| <b>2. Appoint the Committee on Accreditation.</b> Pursuant to Education Code 44372-d and Section 2 of this <i>Framework</i> , <i>the Commission appoints members and alternate members of the Committee on Accreditation for specific terms. The Commission selects the Committee members and alternate members from nominees submitted by the Nominating Panel. The Commission ensures that the Committee on Accreditation is professionally distinguished and balanced in its composition, but does not appoint members to represent particular institutions, organizations or constituencies.</i>   | 44373 (a)<br>44373 (b)<br>44372 (d)              |
| <b>3. Address Issues and Refer Concerns Related to Accreditation.</b> <i>The Commission considers</i>  | 44374 (e)  |

## Accreditation Framework-Section 1

Ed. Code

### Authority and Responsibilities of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing

- 
- |   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| <p><i>issues and concerns related to accreditation that it identifies, as well as those brought to the Commission's attention by the Committee on Accreditation, postsecondary institutions, the Commission's staff, or other concerned individuals or organizations. At its discretion, the Commission may refer accreditation issues and concerns to the Committee on Accreditation for examination and response.</i></p>                         | <p><b>44372 (e)</b></p>     |
| <p><b>4. Review Annual Reports by the Committee on Accreditation.</b> <i>The Commission reviews Annual Accreditation Reports submitted by the Committee on Accreditation. Annual Reports include standard information about the dimensions and results of the accreditation process. Annual Reports may also identify the Committee's issues and concerns, but these may be presented to the Commission separately from the Annual Reports.</i></p> | <p><b>44373 (c) (5)</b></p> |
- 

### D. Responsibilities Related to the Accreditation System

- |  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| <p><b>1. Allocate Resources Annually for Accreditation Operations.</b> <i>The Commission annually allocates resources for accreditation operations to implement this Accreditation Framework. Consistent with the Commission's general practice, staff assignments to accreditation operations are made by the Executive Director, in accordance with state budgets, laws and regulations.</i></p>   | <p><b>44372 (g)</b></p>  |
| <p><b>2. Jointly Sponsor an External Evaluation of Accreditation Policies and Practices.</b> <i>The Commission shares responsibility with the Committee on Accreditation for the design and implementation of a comprehensive evaluation of accreditation policies and the selection of an external evaluator to conduct the evaluation, pursuant to Section 8 of this Accreditation Framework.</i></p>  | <p><b>44372 (h).</b></p> |
| <p><b>3. Review and Sponsor Legislation Related to Accreditation.</b> <i>The Commission reviews legislative proposals to amend the Education Code related to the accreditation of educator preparation institutions. As the need arises, the Commission sponsors legislation related to accreditation, after considering the advice of the Commission's professional staff, the Committee on Accreditation, educational institutions and professional organizations.</i></p> | <p><b>44372 (j)</b></p>  |

## Accreditation Framework-Section 2

Ed. Code

### Functions and Appointment of the Committee on Accreditation

#### A. Functions of the Committee on Accreditation

- 
- |   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| <p><b>1. Comparability of Standards.</b> In accordance with Section 3 of this <i>Framework</i>, the Committee determines whether standards submitted by institutions under Option 2 (National or Professional Program Standards) or Option 5 (Alternative Program Standards), taken as a whole, provide a level of program quality comparable to standards adopted by the Commission under Option 1 (California Program Standards). If the Committee determines that the proposed standards are collectively comparable in breadth and depth, when taken as a whole, to the Commission-adopted standards, the Committee on Accreditation may approve the proposed standards as Program Standards in California.</p> | <p><b>44373 (c) (3)</b></p> |
| <p><b>2. Initial Accreditation of Programs.</b> The Committee reviews proposals for the initial accreditation of programs submitted by institutions that have been determined eligible by the Commission. New programs of educator preparation may be submitted under Options One, Two, Four or Five in Section 3. If the Committee determines that a program meets all applicable standards, the Committee grants initial accreditation to the program.</p>  | <p><b>44373 (c) (2)</b></p> |
-

## Accreditation Framework-Section 2

Ed. Code

### Functions and Appointment of the Committee on Accreditation

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>3. Continuing Accreditation Decisions.</b> After reviewing the recommendations of accreditation teams and the responses of institutions, the Committee makes decisions about the continuing accreditation of educator preparation institutions and programs, consistent with Section 6 of this Framework. <i>Pertaining to each institution, the Committee makes one of three decisions: Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, or Denial of Accreditation.</i></p>  | <p><b>44373 (c) (1)</b><br/><b>44374 (d)</b></p> |
| <p><b>4. Accreditation Procedures.</b> Consistent with the terms of Section 6, the Committee recommends appropriate guidelines for self-study reports and other accreditation materials and exhibits to be prepared by institutions. The Committee also adopts guidelines for accreditation team reports, which emphasize the use of narrative, qualitative explanations of team recommendations. The Committee may provide additional guidance to institutions, teams and the Executive Director regarding accreditation visit procedures. The procedural guidelines of the Committee are published by the Commission as an <i>Accreditation Handbook</i>.</p> | <p><b>44373 (c) (4)</b></p>                      |
| <p><b>5. Monitor the Accreditation System.</b> <i>The Committee monitors the performance of accreditation teams and oversees other activities associated with the accreditation system.</i></p>   | <p><b>44373 (c) (4)</b></p>                      |
| <p><b>6. Annual Reports, Recommendations and Responses.</b> The Committee presents <i>Annual Accreditation Reports</i> to the Commission. Annual Reports include standard information about the dimensions and results of the accreditation process. The Committee also advises the Commission about policy changes to improve the quality and integrity of the accreditation process.</p>  | <p><b>44373 (c) (5)</b></p>                      |
| <p><b>7. Meet in Public Sessions.</b> The Committee conducts its business and makes its decisions in meetings that are open to the public, except as provided by statute.</p>   | <p><b>Bagley-Keene</b></p>                       |
| <p><b>8. Jointly Sponsor an External Evaluation of Accreditation Policies and Practices.</b> <i>The Committee shares responsibility with the Commission for the design and implementation of a comprehensive evaluation of accreditation policies and the selection of an external evaluator to conduct the evaluation, pursuant to Section 8 of the Framework.</i></p>   | <p><b>44372 (h)</b></p>                          |

### B. Membership of the Committee on Accreditation

|   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| <p><b>1. Membership Composition.</b> <i>The Committee consists of twelve members. Six members are from postsecondary education institutions, and six are certificated professionals in public schools, school districts, or county offices of education in California. Selection of members is based on the breadth of their experience, the diversity of their perspectives, and "their distinguished records of accomplishment in education" (Education Code Section 44373-a). All members serve as members-at-large. No member serves on the Committee as a representative of any organization, institution, or constituency. To the maximum extent possible, Committee membership is balanced according to ethnicity, gender, and geographic regions. The Committee includes members from elementary and secondary schools, and from public and private postsecondary institutions. The elementary and secondary school members include at least one certificated administrator, one teacher, and one role specialist. The postsecondary members include at least one administrator and one faculty member, both of whom must be involved in professional teacher education programs.</i></p> | <p><b>44373 (a)</b></p> |
| <p><b>2. Membership Criteria.</b> The criteria for membership on the Committee are: <i>evidence of achievement in the education profession; recognized professional or scholarly contributions in the field of education; recognition of excellence by peers; experience with and sensitivity to issues of human diversity; distinguished service in the field of educator preparation; knowledge of issues related to the preparation and licensing of education professionals; length of professional service; and possession of appropriate educational degrees and professional credentials.</i></p>  | <p><b>44373 (a)</b></p> |

Functions and Appointment of the Committee on Accreditation

C. Appointment of the Committee on Accreditation

1. **Nominating Panel.** *A Nominating Panel* of six distinguished members of the education profession in California identifies and nominates individuals to serve on the Committee on Accreditation. The *Nominating Panel* is comprised of three college and university members and three elementary and secondary school members. The Commission and the Accreditation Advisory Council must reach consensus on the members of the initial Nominating Panel. Subsequently, the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation will reach consensus on new members of the Nominating Panel. The terms of Nominating Panel members are four years long. Members of the Panel may not serve more than one term. **44373 (b)**
2. **Nomination of Committee Members.** To select members for the Committee on Accreditation, the Nominating Panel solicits *nominations* from professional organizations, agencies, institutions, and individuals in education. Each nomination must be submitted with the consent of the individual and the nominee's professional resume. Self-nominations are not accepted. **44373 (b)**
3. **Selection of Initial Committee Members.** Based on the membership criteria and the principles of balanced composition set forth in this section, the Nominating Panel recommends for initial appointment twenty-four highly qualified nominees who are drawn equally from colleges and universities (twelve nominees) and elementary and secondary schools (twelve nominees). The *Commission appoints the twelve members* and six alternate members of the Committee by selecting from the nominations submitted by the Panel. **44372 (d)**
4. **Terms of Appointment.** The Commission appoints members of the Committee on Accreditation to three-year terms. However, the initial appointees include six members with two-year appointments and six with three-year appointments. A member may be renominated and reappointed to a second term of three years. A member may serve a maximum of two terms on the Committee.
5. **Selection of Subsequent Committee Members.** Prior to the conclusion of the Committee members' terms, the Nominating Panel again submits nominations to the Commission, which must be drawn from individuals who have been nominated and reviewed. *The Panel submits twice as many nominees as the number of pending vacancies on the Committee. The Commission fills each Committee seat and alternate position by selecting from the nominations.* **44373 (b)**
6. **Committee Vacancies.** When a seat on the Committee becomes vacant prior to the conclusion of the member's term, the Executive Director fills the seat for the remainder of the term by appointing a replacement from the list of alternate members.

Accreditation Framework- Section 7

Ed. Code

National Accreditation

A. National Accreditation of an Education Unit

- Upon the *request of an institution, the accreditation of an education unit (school, college or department of education) by a national accrediting body will substitute for state accreditation* under the Common Standards *provided that the Committee on Accreditation certifies to the Commission that the national accrediting entity fulfills the following conditions.* **44374 (f)**
1. The national accrediting entity agrees to use the Common Standards that have been adopted by the Commission.
  2. The accreditation process of the national entity includes on-site reviews.

**National Accreditation**

- 
- |  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| <p>3. Accreditation teams represent ethnic and gender diversity, <i>and include elementary and secondary school practitioners and postsecondary education members</i>; a minimum of one voting member of each team is from California.</p> <p>4. For continuing national and state accreditation in California, the national entity agrees to appoint a team that is equivalent in size and structure to an initial accreditation review team.</p> <p>5. The period of accreditation is consistent with a five-year to seven-year cycle, or is compatible with the accreditation cycle established by the state.</p> | <p><b>44374 (b)</b></p> |
|--|-------------------------|
- 

**B. Merged State-National Accreditation Teams and Reviews**

When the above conditions are met for accreditation of an education unit by a national accreditation body, an institution may apply for a merged team and visit for state and national accreditation under the Common Standards and the applicable Program Standards. In a merged visit, a single accreditation team serves the state and national accrediting bodies. The following policies apply.

1. The team has two co-leaders, one appointed according to state accreditation procedures and one appointed by the national accrediting body.
  2. The Common Standards and groups of programs are reviewed by appropriate clusters of reviewers selected by the team co-leaders and the Commission's staff consultant. The cluster of members to review the Common Standards includes members appointed by the national body and at least one California member selected according to state accreditation procedures. Clusters of members to review the applicable Program Standards are selected according to Section 5 of this *Framework*.
  3. The merged team for state and national accreditation represents ethnic and gender diversity.
  4. The team submits a single report regarding all Common Standards and Program Standards to the Committee on Accreditation and the national accrediting body.
- 

**C. National Accreditation of a Credential Program**

|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| <p>Upon <i>the request of an institution, the accreditation of a credential program by a national accrediting entity will substitute for state review of the program provided that the Committee on Accreditation certifies to the Commission that the national accreditation entity satisfies the following conditions.</i></p> | <p><b>44374 (f)</b></p> |
|--|-------------------------|

1. The accrediting entity agrees to use the adopted California Program Standards for the specific credential under Option 1, or the standards used by the national entity are determined by the Committee to be equivalent to those adopted by the Commission under Option 1.
  2. The accreditation process of the national entity includes an on-site review of the credential program.
  3. The accreditation team represents ethnic and gender diversity.
  4. *The accreditation team includes both postsecondary members and elementary and secondary school practitioners*; a minimum of one voting member is from California. **44374 (b)**
  5. The period of accreditation is consistent with a five-year to seven-year cycle, or is compatible with the accreditation cycle established by the state.
-

## Appendix C

### Index of AIR Report Issue: Role of CTC and COA

*To ensure that the work group discussion takes into consideration the work of AIR, staff has prepared the following index of where in the AIR report one can find information pertaining to that discussion. Below is an index of where in their evaluation report AIR makes reference to the roles of COA and CTC. For exact language used in the report, please refer to the report itself. Relevant recommendations or findings are noted in the last column.*

**Staff note:** The AIR study examined the current system within the existing structure. As a result, while there is reference to the Education Code and Framework descriptions of roles and responsibilities of COA and CTC within the report, there are no findings or recommendations pertaining to restructuring or reassigning roles and responsibilities of either COA or CTC.

| Page  | Description of Narrative   | F or R* |
|-------|--|---------|
| 3     | Describes COA responsibilities include continuing accreditation decisions, initial accreditation of eligible institutions, comparability of national or alternative program standards with California standards of educator preparation.   |         |
| 3     | Describes composition and professional nature of COA; COA responsible for developing criteria for selecting BIR members to conduct visits and make recommendations   |         |
| 18    | Describes role and various functions of the COA – summarizing by saying COA focuses “solely on implementing accreditation system.”   |         |
| 19    | Describes COA review of team visit report; consideration of recommendation, and decision to designate accreditation status.  |         |
| 18-19 | Describes key responsibilities of CTC related to accreditation. In particular, determining eligibility of an institution and as an appellate body for accreditation decisions.   |         |
| 22    | Describes the underlying assumption that those involved in accreditation system will have requisite knowledge and skills. Notes appropriate recruitment, selection, and training of COA members.   |         |
| 24    | Notes that COA serves to validate the recommendation of the visit team, as it is independent of the team – process ensures fairness and comparability across reviews.  |         |
| 27    | Chart of CTC’s accreditation system includes description of COA role as determining accreditation decisions based on team recommendation   |         |
| 27    | Chart describing accreditation system includes reference to opportunity for appeal accrediting decisions to CCTC.  |         |
| 32    | Describes how the function, membership, and appointment of the COA are set forth in the Ed Code. Responsibilities are delineated, but not fully distinguished in practice. AIR comments that the level of involvement of CCTC with COA and the nature of the ongoing relationship are not clear. |         |
| 78    | Discusses situations in which accreditation team recommendations were questioned/not accepted by COA.  |         |

|           |   |          |
|-----------|---|----------|
| <b>79</b> | Discusses concerns from IHEs regarding presentation of team recommendation to COA.  |          |
| <b>83</b> | Discusses tension between COA and IHEs due to COA not accepting team findings. Also discusses COA's effort to request "voluntary" reports from institutions and whether such action is an extension of its authority. |          |
| <b>84</b> | Discusses issues related to selection of COA members.   |          |
| <b>86</b> | Contains a finding that the concern that teams exhibit about the COA reaction to their report is unproductive.  | <b>F</b> |
| <b>87</b> | Contains a finding that there continues to be discrepancies in experience and "learning curve" between K-12 and IHE members of the COA and to a lesser extent BIR.  | <b>F</b> |
| <b>87</b> | Contains finding that communication between the COA and BIR has improved in frequency and quality, contributing to better reports and understanding between the Committee and its investigative arm.                  | <b>F</b> |
| <b>88</b> | Contains recommendation that there be more and on-going orientation for COA members. Well prepared decision making body is necessary for a system that is based on professional judgement.                            | <b>R</b> |

**F= Finding; R= Recommendation**

## Index of AIR Report

### Issue: National Accreditation/NCATE

*To ensure that the work group discussion takes into consideration the work of AIR, staff has prepared the following index of where in the AIR report one can find information pertaining to that discussion. Below is an index of where in their evaluation report AIR makes reference to either national accreditation broadly, or NCATE specifically. For exact language used in the report, please refer to the report itself. Relevant recommendations or findings are noted in the last column.*

**Staff note:** The AIR study examined issues of national accreditation within the existing structure and Framework. As a result, AIR examined the merged NCATE/CCTC relationship as it is implemented. The report did not examine or comment on whether the existing structure is the most effective, or appropriate structure to carry out California Education Code.

| Page              | Description of Narrative  | F or R*  |
|-------------------|---|----------|
| <b>6 &amp; 85</b> | Contains finding that, “CCTC’s partnership with NCATE reflects a strong commitment to assist California institutions seeking national accreditation. This commitment is reflected in the recently renegotiated partnership between the Commission and NCATE. Challenges to implementing this partnership include alignment between CCTC standards and the subjective personal interaction between state and national teams in data collection and decision-making.” | <b>F</b> |
| <b>56-58</b>      | Describes several of the impediments to coordination of NCATE and CCTC standards: using different formats, understanding the differences between the standards; recognizing the distinct roles of BIR members versus NCATE team members; reconciliation of reports; understanding how the two processes articulate  |          |
| <b>75</b>         | Summarizes survey data (IHEs and review team participants). Concludes that there was general agreement that conducting merged NCATE/CCTC visits was a good idea.  |          |
| <b>75-76</b>      | Summarizes from survey concerns raised about merged NCATE/CCTC visits. (personality conflicts, NCATE process as implemented in California, NCATE dominating team discussion, lack of knowledge of California programs and requirements by NCATE reviewers; quality and qualifications of NCATE reviewers; complexity of merged visits.  |          |
| <b>91-92</b>      | Contains recommendation that CCTC review the need for maintaining Options 3, General Program Standard. In so doing, AIR comments on “The National and Professional Standards (Option 2) is particularly important for specialized programs and allows them to participate fully in their professions, and so therefore should be maintained.”   | <b>R</b> |
| <b>97</b>         | Recommends that on merged visits, all BIR members need specific orientation to the NCATE 2000 standards, similarities and differences from CCTC Common Standards, to enable all team members, not simply those on Common Standards cluster, to effectively gather and triangulate data using the NCATE standards as a measuring tool.   | <b>R</b> |

**F= Finding; R= Recommendation**